

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 9–11, 13–17, 26, 29–32, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, and 46 have been amended. Claims 8, 12, 39, 48, and 49 have been canceled. Claims 50 and 51 have previously been canceled. No new claims have been added. Claims 1–7, 9–11, 13–38, and 40–47 remain in the application. Claims 31–49 have previously been allowed, and Claims 12–14 have been indicated as allowable but objected to because dependent upon a rejected base claim. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Summary of the Amendments

Amendments to the Claims

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of former Claims 8 and 12, now canceled.

Claims 9–11, formerly dependent from Claim 8 (now canceled), have been amended to depend from Claim 1.

Claims 13 and 14, formerly dependent from Claim 12 (now canceled), have been amended to depend from Claim 1.

Claims 15–17, 26, 29–32, 35, 36, 38, 40, 41, 43, 44, and 46 have been amended to make the subject matter of the claims clearer. The amendments are not made to overcome any prior art and are not made to overcome any rejections posed by the examiner.

Double Patenting Rejections

Claims 1, 18–22, 48, and 49 have been rejected for double patenting over Claims 1–8 of U.S. Patent No. 6,855,115. The rejection is moot in view of the foregoing amendments.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of former Claims 8 and 12, now canceled, neither of which formed the basis for a double patenting rejection. The rejection of Claim 1 for double patenting is thus moot. Claims 18-22 depend from Claim 1 and include all of the limitations of Claim 1. The rejection of Claims 18-22 for double patenting is therefore also moot. And Claims 48 and 49 have been canceled, rendering their rejection moot.

Rejections Over Prior Art

Claims 1-7, 15-17, and 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Gershenfeld et al (6,025,725). Claims 8-10 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gershenfeld et al. These rejections are moot in view of the foregoing amendments to Claim 1.

Claim 12 has been indicated as being allowable but is objected to because dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claim 12 was dependent upon Claim 8, which in turn was dependent upon Claim 1. Claim 1 has now been amended to incorporate the limitations of both former Claims 8 and 12, now canceled, and Claim 1 is thus now allowable.

Claims 13 and 14 have also been indicated as being allowable but are objected to because dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claims 13 and 14 were formerly dependent on Claim 12, the limitations of which have now been incorporated into Claim 1. Claims 13 and 14 have now been changed to depend from Claim 1 and are thus believed allowable.

Claims 2–7, 9–11, and 15–30 all depend, directly or indirectly, from Claim 1. For the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 1, Claims 2–7, 9–11, and 15–30 are now allowable.

While no additional fees are believed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees and credit any refund to Deposit Account No. 11-0855.

The foregoing is believed fully responsive to the Office Action dated April 15, 2009. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance issue in this case.

Respectfully submitted:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Larry A. Roberts", is written over a horizontal line.

Larry A. Roberts
Reg. No. 31,871

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street
Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
Tel. (404) 745–2409
Fax (404) 815–6555
E-mail: lroberts@kilpatrickstockton.com